

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

Michael Rodriguez,

Plaintiff,

v.

Naphcare, Inc., et. al,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:17-cv-02344-RFB-DJA

Order

Before the Court is *pro se* Plaintiff Michael Rodriguez' motion to extend the time for him to file replies to Defendants' responses to Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration. (ECF No. 304). Plaintiff filed his motion to extend on May 22, 2022. (*Id.*). His deadline to file replies to Defendants' responses passed on May 19, 2022. (*Id.*).

Under Local Rule IA 6-1(a), a motion to extend time made after the expiration of the specified period will not be granted unless the movant demonstrates that the failure to file the motion before the deadline expired was the result of excusable neglect. Plaintiff has made that showing here. Plaintiff explains that, because he is incarcerated, he did not receive Defendants' responses until a few days before his reply was due. As a result, he was unable to file his replies until after the deadline passed.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion to extend time (ECF No. 304) is **granted**. The Clerk of Court is kindly directed to detach Plaintiff's replies—attached to his motion at ECF No. 304-1 at pages 2-8 and ECF No. 304-2 at pages 2-9—and file them on the docket. The Court will consider these replies timely filed.

DATED: July 15, 2022


DANIEL J. ALBREGTS
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE